

Page 12 of 18
Application No. 09/259,984
Amendment D

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 45 has been amended, claims 6-9, 28-31 and 51 were previously canceled, and new claims 57-59 were added. Therefore, fifty (50) claims remain pending, claims 1-5, 10-27, 32-50 and 52-59. The amendments to claim 1 simply address typographical errors and the amendments to claims 1 and 45 do not add new matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the following remarks demonstrate that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and further respectfully request a notice of allowance.

By way of this response, Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (858) 552-1311 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19-27, 32, 33, 38, 39, 41-48, 50 and 52-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kikinis U.S. Patent No. 5,929,849 in view of Legall et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents fail to teach or suggest each element of at least independent claims 1, 23 and 45. More specifically, neither the Kikinis nor the Legall patents teach or suggest at least "a buffer logic circuit ... facilitating the transfer of commands and the digital signals between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals" (claim 1).

The office action equates "URL data" with both claimed "programming data" and "facilitating the transfer of commands." Specifically, the office action on page 4, at about line 2 equates "URL data" with both "programming data" and then later on page 4 at about line 19 suggests that "selection of URL data sends the digital URL command data received from the tuner to the modem..." is equivalent to claimed facilitating the transfer of command (emphasis added). Therefore, the office action is equating the same element of Kikinis (i.e., URL data) to

Page 13 of 18
Application No. 09/259,984
Amendment D

being equal to two separate claim elements, and thus effectively reading at least one claim limitation right out of the claim.

Further, the Kikinis patent does not teach or suggest communicating "URL commands" but instead only describes using the "URL" data supplied "in the data region between frames" that can be used to define the WWW address of an advertiser's page (col. 7, lines 65-66, emphasis added). The Kikinis patent does not teach or suggest "URL commands" as suggested in the office action. Instead, the Kikinis patent only describes, as cited in the office action, at column 7, lines 57-67 that "If the viewer ... actuate[s] a selection signal ... the system executes browser routines, accessing the WWW...." (emphasis added). Thus, the Kikinis patent describes a user or viewer activating through a remote controller a selection to initiate access to a website according to the URL data. The Kikinis patent does not teach a buffer logic unit that facilitates the transfer of commands. Additionally, the Kikinis patent does not describe at least facilitating the transfer of commands between "decoder/tuner 13" (equated by the office action to the claimed "circuit that receives wireless communication signals") and the "ISDN 39, modem 34, VGA chipset 33" (equated by the office action to the claimed "circuit that receives computer network communication signals"). Further, the Kikinis patent fails to teach or suggest that there is communication of at least commands between the "decoder/tuner 13" and the "ISDN 39, modem 34, VGA chipset 33". The URL data is not a command but simply data that is used to access a website. Furthermore, the Kikinis patent does not teach a buffer logic circuit as claimed that facilitates the "transfer of commands and the digital signals between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the Kikinis patent does not teach or suggest a buffer logic circuit that at least facilitates the transfer of commands between claimed circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals.

Additionally, the office action appears to further be suggesting that a "viewer's selection of an icon" in combination with the URL data is equivalent to a command. However, a viewer's selection through the remote control is not a command that is communicated between a

Page 14 of 18
Application No. 09/259,984
Amendment D

circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals according to the Kikinis patent. Instead, the Kikinis patent specifically limits the communication from the remote control 63 to be exclusively with the CUP 19.

The Legall patent thus fails to teach or suggest at least a buffer logic circuit that facilitates communication between the circuit that receives television signals and the circuit that receives network signals. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious in view of the applied combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents.

Furthermore, neither the Kikinis nor the Legall patents teach or suggest a buffer logic circuit as claimed. The office action equates the CPU and MPEG decoder of the Kikinis patent to being equivalent to the buffer logic circuit as claimed. However, the CPU and MPEG decoder of the Kikinis patent do not facilitate the transfer of at least commands between the "circuit that receives wireless television communication signals" and the "circuit that receives computer network communication signals" as recited in claim 1. The office action further attempts to suggest that the CPU and MPEG decoder "include buffer memories" (office action, page 4, line 8). However, the Kikinis patent does not teach that these elements include buffer memories and further the office action fails to demonstrate where the Kikinis patent teaches buffer memories. Additionally, even if we assume *arguendo* that the CPU and MPEG decoder may contain buffer memories, the buffer memories do not define the CPU and MPEG decoder as being equivalent the claimed buffer logic circuit. Therefore, the combination of references fails to teach or make claim 1 obvious.

Dependent claims 2-5, 10-22, 53-54 and 57-59 depend from claim 1, therefore, claims 2-5, 10-22, 53-54 and 57-59 are also not obvious in view of the combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents due at least to their dependency on claim 1.

Independent claim 23 includes claim language similar to that of claim 1 reciting in part, for example, "buffering and controlling the transfer of commands and at least portions of the sensory data and the programming data between the first and second circuits through a third circuit." Again, the combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents do not teach or make obvious

Page 15 of 18
Application No. 09/259,984
Amendment D

at least the buffering and controlling the transfer of commands. Therefore, claim 23 is also not obvious in view of the applied combination of references. Dependent claims 24-27, 32-44 and 55-56 depend from claim 23, and thus, are also not obvious in view of the combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents due at least to their dependency on claim 23.

Similarly, independent claim 45 includes claim language similar to that of claim 1. The combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents do not teach or make obvious at least the buffer logic that facilitates the transfer of commands. Therefore, claim 45 is also not obvious in view of the applied combination of references.

Further, claim 45 has been amended to recite that the buffer logic circuit comprises at least one buffer, and buffers and facilitates communication. No new matter was added by this amendment. Support for the amendment is provided throughout the application as filed, for example at least on page 9 at about lines 6-21. The office action equated "control routines 48" stored in DRAM 49 to the claimed "buffer logic". However, the control routines do not facilitate communication, do not buffer communications, and do not comprise a buffer as claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 45 is not obvious in view of the applied combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents.

Dependent claims 46-50 and 52 depend from claim 45, therefore, claims 46-50 and 52 are also not obvious in view of the combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents due at least to their dependency on claim 1.

2. Claims 18 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Kikinis patent in view of the Legall patent in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,081,628 (Maekawa et al.). Applicants have demonstrated above that independent claims 1 and 23 are not obvious in view of the combination of Kikinis and Legall. The Maekawa patent also fails to teach or suggest at least buffer logic circuit that facilitates "the transfer of commands and the digital signals between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals" as recited in claim 1, and also fails to teach or suggest at least the "buffering and controlling the transfer of commands and

Page 16 of 18
Application No. 09/259,984
Amendment D

at least portions of the sensory data and the programming data between the first and second circuits through a third circuit" as recited in claim 23. Claim 18 depends from claim 1, and claim 40 depends from claim 23. Therefore, claims 18 and 40 are also not obvious over the combination of references for at least the reasons provided above.

3. Claims 12, 13, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Kikinis and Legall patents in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,384 (Schultheiss). Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 1, and claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 23. As demonstrated above, the combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents fails to make claims 1 and 23 obvious. The Schultheiss patent fails to teach at least those aspects of claims 1 and 23 that are not taught by the Kikinis and Legall patents. Therefore, claims 12, 13, 34 and 35 are also not obvious over the combined references for at least the reasons provided above.

4. Claims 14, 15, 36, 37 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Kikinis and Legall patents as applied to claims 1, 23 and 45 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,264 (Maze et al.). Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 1, claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 23 and claim 49 depends from claim 45. As demonstrated above, the combination of the Kikinis and Legall patents fails to make claims 1, 23 and 45 obvious. The Maze patent fails to teach at least those aspects of claims 1, 23 and 45 that are not taught by the Kikinis and Legall patents. Therefore, claims 14, 15, 36, 37 and 49 are also not obvious over the combined references for at least the reasons provided above.

New Claims 47-49

5. New claims 47-49 are also not obvious in view of the applied references. Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to teach or suggest a buffer logic circuit as claimed at least in claim 1. Claims 47-49 depend from claim 1 and thus are also not anticipated by the applied references. Further, the applied references do not teach or suggest an option palette that has "a planner screen that displays a calendar indicating programs that are

Page 17 of 18
Application No. 09/259,984
Amendment D

selected"; buffer logic circuit comprising a multiplexer; or buffer logic circuit further comprising an address decoder. Therefore, claims 47-49 are not obvious in view of the applied references.

No Fees Believed Due

6. New claims 57-59 have been added. Applicants have not authorized the payment of any fees as no fees are believed due. Because nine claims were previously cancelled (i.e., claims 6-9, 28-31 and 51), and only six (6) claims were previously added (i.e., 51-56), the additional three claims 57-59 do not require the payment of an additional fees because Applicants have already paid for the examination of 50 claims upon filing of the subject application. No new matter has been added by the new claims 57-59 as the application as filed provided support for these claims. For example, claim 57 is supported at least on pages 16-17, and similarly, claims 58 and 59 are supported at least on pages 8-9.


Page 18 of 18
Application No. 09/259,984
Amendment D

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the above remarks demonstrate that the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 16, 2005



Steven M. Freeland
Reg. No. 42,555
Attorney for Applicants
(858) 552-1311

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Thomas F. Lebens
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603

422182v1